

Three Views of a Secret in Relativistic Thermodynamics

Tadas K. Nakamura
CFAAS, Fukui Prefectural University*

It has been shown three different views in relativistic thermodynamics can be derived from the basic formulation proposed by van Kampen and Israel. The way to decompose energy-momentum into the reversible and irreversible parts is not uniquely determined, and different choices result in different views. The effect of difference in the definition of a finite volume is also considered.

Keywords: relativity, thermodynamics, Lorentz transform

There has been long controversy about the relativistic thermodynamics. A number of theories were proposed in 1960s, and the discussion seems to have arrived at a vague general agreement that each theory is consistent in its own framework by early 1970s Yuen [1]. However, papers has been still published long after that, even until today (e.g., Requardt [2], de Parga et al. [3]), proposing new formulations which are allegedly better than others.

Roughly speaking there are three different views on the relativistic thermodynamics, which are characterized by the difference in the temperature T of a moving body in the following:

$$\begin{cases} \text{I)} & T = T_0 \gamma^{-1}, \\ \text{II)} & T = T_0 \gamma, \\ \text{III)} & T = T_0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where T_0 is the temperature measured in a frame comoving with the body, γ is the Lorentz factor defined as $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-v^2}$ with the speed of the body v relative to the rest frame (we use the unit of $c = 1$).

Most of theories proposed so far can be categorized into one of the above three. Papers published right after the establishment of special relativity (e.g., Einstein [4], Planck [5]) are based on View I. Theories with View II were extensively investigated in the middle of 1960s (e.g, Gamba [6], Kibble [7]) stimulated by the papers by Ott [8] and Arzelies [9]. A little later a theory in View III was proposed by Lansberg [10].

There is another theory by van Kampen [11] in View III; his stand point is quite different from other theories in Views I, II, and III. He treats the three components of the velocity as thermodynamical parameters in addition to the temperature. The van Kampen's theory was later refined by Israel [12] into a more transparent form.

The author of the present paper strongly believes this van Kampen-Israel theory is the one in *the book*, i.e., the very fundamental one based on which other formulations can be derived. The purpose of the present paper is to show the above three views can be actually derived from the van Kampen-Israel theory. The great advantage of the van Kampen-Israel theory is in the point that it does not need the concept of heat or work. The second law can be expressed with well defined mechanical quantities such as the energy-momentum or four velocity.

The difference of the above three views mainly comes from the difference in the definition of heat. Non-relativistic thermodynamics decomposes the energy increase ΔE into two parts, heat ΔQ and work ΔW namely, as $\Delta E = \Delta Q + \Delta W$. Since the energy is one component of the energy-momentum four vector, the decomposition should be expressed in the form of four vectors in the relativistic thermodynamics:

$$\Delta \bar{G} = \Delta \bar{Q} + \Delta \bar{W}, \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta \bar{G}$ is the change of the energy-momentum, and its reversible and irreversible parts are expressed as $\Delta \bar{W}$ and $\Delta \bar{Q}$; we denote a four vector as a whole by a bar (e.g., $\bar{G}$) and its each component by indices (e.g., G^μ) in this paper.

Most of theories in Views I and II determine the temperature from the following entropy expression.

$$\Delta S = \frac{\Delta Q}{T}, \quad (3)$$

where ΔQ is the temporal component of $\Delta \bar{Q}$. However, there is ambiguity in the decomposition in (2) and the heat is not uniquely determined as we will see in the present paper. Views I and II define the heat as $\Delta Q = \Delta Q_0 \gamma^{-1}$ and $\Delta Q = \Delta Q_0 \gamma$ (ΔQ_0 is the heat measured in the comoving frame) respectively, and both definitions are consistent as the temporal component of an irreversible energy-momentum change. Consequently two different temperatures (Views I and II) are derived from (1) since the entropy is supposed to be Lorentz invariant. View III tries to accommodate both somehow.

The author considers this difference of $\Delta\bar{Q}$ is the main reason for the confusion in relativistic thermodynamics. However, the definition of a finite volume may also make the problem complicated. This point has been known since the very early years of relativity (Fermi [13]), and must have been well recognized during the controversy in 1960s (Yuen [1], Gamba [6], Kibble [7]). However, curiously enough, its importance is not well understood and a number of erroneous statements on this point are found in papers since 1960s to this date.

We will see in the present paper these confusions can be cleared by the covariant expression of the van Kampen-Israel theory. For this purpose it is convenient to define the volume as a four vector (Nakamura [14]):

$$V^\eta(\bar{w}) = \frac{w^\eta V_0}{w^\mu u_\mu}. \quad (4)$$

This four vector represents a space-like volume orthogonal to the unit vector w^η ; in other words, this vector defines the volume viewed in a reference frame with the four velocity $\bar{w}$.

The van Kampen-Israel theory defines the entropy change of a matter with a finite volume as

$$\Delta S = \beta_0 u_\mu V^\nu \Delta T_\nu^\mu - \beta_0 u_\mu P \Delta V^\mu, \quad (5)$$

where P , T_ν^μ are the pressure and energy momentum tensor respectively, and $\beta_0 = 1/T_0$ is the inverse temperature measured in the rest frame.

When we define the total energy-momentum four vector as $G^\mu(\bar{w}) = V^\nu(\bar{w}) T_\nu^\mu$ then (5) can be expressed as

$$\Delta S = \beta_0 u_\mu [\Delta G^\mu(\bar{w}) - P \Delta V^\mu(\bar{w})]. \quad (6)$$

Both $\Delta\bar{G}$ and $\Delta\bar{V}$ depends on $\bar{w}$, i.e., the direction of the volume in the Minkowski space, however, the dependence is canceled out by taking inner product with u_μ and ΔS becomes invariant.

The heat/work is defined as an irreversible/reversible part of the energy-momentum $\Delta\bar{G}$ in (2), which means

$$\beta_0 u_\mu \Delta Q^\mu > 0, \quad \beta_0 u_\mu [\Delta W^\mu - P \Delta V^\mu] = 0. \quad (7)$$

Obviously the above conditions cannot determine the heat and work uniquely; when we define new values of the heat and work by $\Delta\bar{Q}' = \Delta\bar{Q} + \bar{A}$ and $\Delta\bar{W}' = \Delta\bar{W} - \bar{A}$ with an arbitrary four vector $\bar{A}$ that satisfies $u_\mu A^\mu = 0$, (7) holds for the new values $\Delta\bar{Q}'$ and $\Delta\bar{W}'$. This ambiguity causes the difference in (1) as we will see in the following.

Suppose a matter moving in the x direction with a four velocity $(u_t, u_x, 0, 0)$. Then energy momentum tensor may be written in the rest frame as

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} u_t^2 \varepsilon_0 + u_x^2 P & u_t u_x (\varepsilon_0 + P) \\ u_t u_x (\varepsilon_0 + P) & u_x^2 \varepsilon_0 + u_t^2 P \end{pmatrix},$$

with ε_0 being the energy density measured in the comoving frame. We ignore the dimension in y and z direction for simplicity. Note that ε_0 and P do not depend on t or x because the matter is in the equilibrium state.

We introduce a parameter $\theta = \tanh^{-1}(w^x/w^t)$ to define the volume in (4). Then the total energy-momentum can be expressed as a function of θ in the following:

$$\bar{G}(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} E(\theta) \\ G(\theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} E_0 \cosh \alpha + P V_0 \sinh \alpha \tanh(\theta - \alpha) \\ E_0 \sinh \alpha + P V_0 \cosh \alpha \tanh(\theta - \alpha) \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where $E_0 = \varepsilon_0 V_0$ is the total energy measured in the comoving frame, and the velocity of the matter is parametrized by $\alpha = \tanh^{-1}(u^x/u^t)$ instead of $\bar{u}$.

We need another parameter to fix the ambiguity of heat in (2). Let us introduce a parameter ϕ such that

$$\Delta\bar{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta Q \\ \Delta Q \tanh \phi \end{pmatrix}$$

to this end. This parameter ϕ specifies the frame in which the heat is purely timelike, in other words, the frame in which the heat looks “heat” only without momentum. The rest frame and comoving frame are represented by $\phi = 0$ and $\phi = \alpha$ respectively.

The work $\Delta\bar{W}$ is then calculated as

$$\Delta\bar{W} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta E_0 \cosh \alpha + \Delta(PV_0) \sinh \alpha \tanh(\theta - \alpha) - \Delta Q \\ \Delta E_0 \sinh \alpha + \Delta(PV_0) \cosh \alpha \tanh(\theta - \alpha) - \Delta Q \tanh \phi \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since the work $\Delta\bar{W}$ must satisfy (7), the heat ΔQ is uniquely determined when ϕ is given:

$$\Delta Q(\phi) = \frac{\cosh \phi}{\cosh(\phi - \alpha)} \Delta Q_0, \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta Q_0 = \Delta E_0 - P\Delta V_0$.

Various formulations can be derived by expressing $\Delta Q(\phi)$ in (9) with the energy-momentum $\bar{G}(\theta)$ in (8) by choosing different ϕ and θ . Any value of ϕ and θ can determine the relativistic thermodynamical equation in general, however, the value of the rest frame or the comoving frame (0 or α) are practically preferable choices. In the following we examine three typical choices in Views I, II, and III.

Typical theories choose the same value for ϕ and θ ($\phi = \theta$) because they consider the heat exchange and volume change in the same frame [15]. For example, Ott [8] assumes a Carnot cycle in the comoving frame; the steps in the cycle, including the heat exchange and volume change, take place in the moving frame. Then (9) can be cast in the form of

$$Q(\theta) = \frac{\cosh \theta}{\cosh(\theta - \alpha)} \Delta E_0 - P\Delta V^t(\theta).$$

The temporal component $\Delta V^t(\theta)$ is regarded as the volume change in these theories, and denoted simply by ΔV and little attention has been paid to its dependence on θ . Then the above equation can be regarded as to correspond to the definition of heat $\Delta Q = \Delta E - P\Delta V$ in non-relativistic thermodynamics. The coefficient of the ΔE_0 term determines the transformation rule of the heat, and consequently, that of the temperature.

View I is typically derived with $\phi = \theta = 0$, which means both the heat and volume are defined in the rest frame. This choice gives $\Delta Q = \Delta Q_0\gamma^{-1}$ and thus $T = T_0\gamma^{-1}$ because of (3). The calculation of heat is obtained by subtracting $\gamma^{-1}u_x\Delta G$ from the energy, regarding this as the work to cause acceleration:

$$\Delta Q(0) = E(0) - \gamma^{-1}u_x\Delta G(0) - P\Delta V(0), \quad (10)$$

where we write $\Delta V = \Delta V^t$.

The typical choice of View II is $\phi = \theta = \alpha$, resulting $T = T_0\gamma$. The heat and the volume are defined in the comoving frame, and the expression in the rest frame is a result of their Lorentz transform. The calculation of ΔQ is straightforward:

$$\Delta Q(\alpha) = \Delta E(\alpha) - P\Delta V(\alpha). \quad (11)$$

Lansberg [10] considered the temperature must be a Lorentz-invariant as in View III from the symmetry. When two identical systems are moving relative to each other, there is no reason for one system to have a temperature higher than the others'. This argument can be represented by choosing $\phi = \frac{1}{2}\alpha$ in (9) to treat the rest frame and the comoving frame symmetrically. It should be noted that his actual calculation is more complicated, but we do not examine its details here.

In the present paper we have successfully derived three different views of relativistic thermodynamics from one basic formulation proposed by van Kampen [11] and Israel [12]. The difference comes from two factors, the definitions of the heat and volume namely, which are represented by the two parameters ϕ and θ here. The papers published so far on this topic are so numerous that it is not practical to check all of them. However, the author believes all the formulations can be derived from the van Kampen-Israel theory as long as they are not wrong.

* Electronic address: tadas@fpu.ac.jp

[1] C. K. Yuen, Amer. J. Phys. **38**, 246 (1970).

[2] M. Requardt, arXiv:0801.2639.

- [3] G. A. de Parga, López-Carrera, and F. Anulo-Brown, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 2821 (2005).
- [4] A. Einstein, Jb. Radioaktivitat **4**, 411 (1907).
- [5] M. Planck, Ann. d. Phys. **76**, 1 (1908).
- [6] A. Gamba, Nuovo Cimento **37**, 1792 (1965).
- [7] T. W. B. Kibble, Nuovo Cimento **41B**, 167 (1966).
- [8] H. Ott, Z. Physik **175**, 70 (1963).
- [9] H. Arzelies, Nuovo Cimento **35**, 792 (1965).
- [10] P. T. Lansberg, Nature **212**, 571 (1966).
- [11] N. G. van Kampen, Phys. Rev. **173**, 295 (1968).
- [12] W. Israel, Ann. Phys. **106**, 310 (1976).
- [13] E. Fermi, Nuovo Cimentto **25**, 159 (1923).
- [14] T. K. Nakamura, Phys. Lett. A **352**, 175 (2006), arXiv:physics/0505004.
- [15] This is typical, but not always. For example, the result by Kibble [7] can be derived with $\phi = \alpha$ and $\theta = 0$.